arXiv:quant-ph/0608049v1 6 Aug 2006

Locality and the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger Theorem

A. Fahmi[1]*and M. Golshani[1,2]†

[1]Institute for Studies in Theoretical Physics and Mathematics (IPM), P. O. Box 19395-5531, Tehran, Iran.
[2]Department of Physics, Sharif University of Technology, P. O. Box 11365-9161, Tehran, Iran.

(February 1, 2008)

Abstract

In all local realistic theories worked out till now, locality is considered as a basic assumption. Most people in the field consider the inconsistency between local realistic theories and quantum mechanics to be a result of non-local nature of quantum mechanics. In this Paper, we derive the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger type theorem for particles with instantaneous (non-local) interactions at the hidden-variable level. Then, we show that the previous contradiction still exists between quantum mechanics and non-local hidden variable models.
PACS number : 03.67.Dd, 03.65.Ud
Keywords: Non-locality, GHZ Theorem, Hidden variables.

1 Introduction

One of the main problems in physics that has attracted physicists' attention in recent years is locality. This notion has different meanings, interpretations and applications in different fields of studies. Physicists consider locality principle as a physical constraint which should be satisfied by any new theory. Quantum mechanics (QM) has been challenging this principle for a long period. Non-locality in QM, however, enters into calculations as a consequence of the entanglement between some appropriate degrees of freedom of two separated particles, which makes them to show a correlated behavior. Entanglement has emerged as one of the most striking feature of quantum mechanics. However, an exact quantitative relation between non-locality and entanglement is not been known. The non-local property of QM was first demonstrated by Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) [1], who explicitly suggested that any physical theory must be both local and realistic. The manifestation of these conditions was then appeared in the so-called Bell inequality [2], where locality is a crucial assumption, violated by quantum mechanical predictions. From the so-called Bell's inequalities one can infer Bell's theorem which states that: " *In a certain experiment all realistic local theories with hidden variables are incompatible with quantum mechanics* ". In Bell's theorem, the locality assumption was involved quantitatively for the first time. In the other words; If the result of measurement on the particle 1 (2) is called A (B), then, in a local hidden variable (LHV) model, the locality condition is defined as:

$$A(a,b,\lambda) = A(a,\lambda), \qquad B(a,b,\lambda) = B(b,\lambda). \tag{1}$$

In the above expression the result of a measurement on the particle 1 (2) is independent of parameters and the result of the measurement performed on the particle 2 (1). The various experiments have been performed to distinguish between QM and local realistic theories [3]. The existing contradiction between QM and LHV models, and also the violation of Bell's inequality in experiments lead us to conclude that we may doubt on one of the initial assumptions of Bell's inequality, i.e, locality or reality. Of course, there are some people who believe that other assumptions and loopholes might be involved, instead of the locality and reality

*fahmi@theory.ipm.ac.ir
†golshani@ihcs.ac.ir

assumptions [4, 5]. For example, in a recent paper, Barrett *et al.* [4] used the two-side memory loophole, in which the hidden variables of n pair can depend on the previous measurement choices and outcomes in both wings of the experiment. They have shown that the two-side memory loophole allows a systematic violation of the CHSH inequality.

Bell's inequality has been derived in different ways [6, 7, 8]. Greenberger *et al.* [9], Hardy [10] and Cabello [11] have shown that it is possible to demonstrate the existence of non-locality for the case of more than two particles without using any inequality. In another model, Scarani and Gisin [12] considered some superluminal hidden communication or influences to reproduce the non-local correlations. There exists another attempting to clarify QM properties. For example, Zeilinger *et al.* [13] suggested information explanation of QM. Others works on this subject can be summarized as follows: The extension of Bell's inequality and Greenberger, Horne, Zeilinger (GHZ) theorem to continuous-variables [14]; The Bell-type inequality that involves all possible settings of the local measurements apparatus [15]; The extension of local hidden variable models (LHV) to multiparticle and multilevel systems [16]; The violation of Bell's inequality beyond Cirelson's bound [17].

On the other hand, as is known, Bell shows that it is impossible to reproduce the Bell correlation function by using a local realistic model. Some people extended Bell's approach, by considering realistic interpretation of QM and showed that exact simulation of the Bell correlation (singlet state) is possible by using local hidden variables augmented by just one bit of classical communication [18, 19]. Hence, it has recently been shown that all causal correlations between two parties which respectively give one bit outputs a and b upon receiving one bit inputs x and y can be expressed as convex combinations of local correlations (i.e., correlations that can be simulated with local random variables) and non-local correlations of the form $a + b = x \cdot y \quad mod\ 2$. They showed that a single instance of the latter elementary non-local correlation suffices to simulate exactly all possible projective measurements that can be performed on the singlet state of two qubits, with no communication needed at all [20]. Although, these theories explain some part of QM, but they could not present a complete description of QM. For example, in the Popescu and Rohrlich non-local machine [20], we have not all of QM properties, it has been shown that entanglement swapping is not simulated by a non-local machine [21] and quantum multiparties correlations arising from measurements on a cluster state cannot be simulated by a n non-local boxes, for any n [22].

In this Paper, we derive the GHZ-type [9] theorem for particles with instantaneous (non-local) interactions at the hidden-variable level. Then, *we show that the previous contradiction still exists between QM and non-local hidden variable models.*

2 Locality Condition in the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger Theorem

Greenberger, Horne and Zeilinger (GHZ) showed the consequence of Bell's theorem in a different way [9], using a system which consists of three or more correlated spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ particles. GHZ argued that if quantum mechanical predictions hold true for the entangled three-particle or four-particle states, then the local hidden variable theories cannot reproduce quantum mechanical results. The GHZ theorem is, in fact, a synthesis of Bell's theorem [2] and Kochen-Specker's theorem [8], and it indicates that we cannot attribute values to the results of simultaneous measurements of three or more correlated particles, without encountering a mathematical inconsistency. This theorem provides a new test for the evaluation of concepts like locality and non-contextuality on the basis of complete quantum correlations (for multi-particle entangled states, the assumption of non-contextuality is usually taken to be equivalent to locality). GHZ considerd a system of four spin $\frac{1}{2}$ particles so that particles 1 and 2 move freely in the positive z-direction and particles 3 and 4 in the negative z-direction. The Stern-Gerlach orientation analyzers are $\widehat{n}_1, \widehat{n}_2, \widehat{n}_3$ and $\widehat{n}_4$ for the beams of particles $1, 2, 3$ and 4, respectively. If these four particles result from the decay of a single spin-1 particle into a pair of spin-1 particles, each of which decays into a pair of spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ particles, then, with the z component of spin initially zero and remaining so throughout the decay process, the quantum mechanical spin state of the four particles is:

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|+\rangle_1|+\rangle_2|-\rangle_3|-\rangle_4 - |-\rangle_1|-\rangle_2|+\rangle_3|+\rangle_4].$$

The expectation value $E(\widehat{n}_1, \widehat{n}_2, \widehat{n}_3\widehat{n}_4)$ of the product of outcomes, when the orientations are as indicated, is:

$$\begin{aligned} E(\widehat{n}_1, \widehat{n}_2, \widehat{n}_3\widehat{n}_4) &= \langle\psi|(\overrightarrow{\sigma}_1.\widehat{n}_1)(\overrightarrow{\sigma}_2.\widehat{n}_2)(\overrightarrow{\sigma}_3.\widehat{n}_3)(\overrightarrow{\sigma}_4.\widehat{n}_4)|\psi\rangle = \cos\theta_1\cos\theta_2\cos\theta_3\cos\theta_4 \\ &\quad - \sin\theta_1\sin\theta_2\sin\theta_3\sin\theta_4 \times \cos(\phi_1 + \phi_2 - \phi_3 - \phi_4) \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $(\theta_i\phi_i)$ are polar and azimuthal angles of $\widehat{n}_i$. For simplicity, we shall restrict our attention to $\widehat{n}$'s in the $x - y$ plane, so that:

$$E(\widehat{n}_1, \widehat{n}_2, \widehat{n}_3\widehat{n}_4) = E(\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3, \phi_4) = -\cos(\phi_1 + \phi_2 - \phi_3 - \phi_4) \tag{3}$$

EPR's assumptions in the GHZ argument can be adapted to the four-particle situation as follows:
(i) Perfect correlation: Knowledge of the outcomes for any three particles enables a prediction with certainty for the outcome of the fourth.
(ii) Locality: Since the four particles are arbitrarily far apart at the time of measurement, and are assumed not to interact, hence no real change can takes place in any one of them as a consequence of what is done on the other three.
(iii) Reality: If, without in any way disturbing a system, we can predict with certainty (i.e. with probability equal to unity) the value of a physical quantity, then there exists an element of physical reality corresponding to this physical quantity.
(iv) Completeness: Every element of the physical reality must have a counterpart in the physical theory.
Noting the above premises, GHZ defined four functions $A(\phi_1, \lambda), B(\phi_2, \lambda), C(\phi_3, \lambda), D(\phi_4, \lambda)$ with values $+1$ and -1, these functions being the outcomes of spin measurement along the respective directions when the complete state of the four particles is specified by λ. Using the above premises and some algebra, GHZ could derive following relations [9]:

$$A(2\phi, \lambda) = A(0, \lambda) = Const., \qquad \forall\ \phi$$

$$A(\phi' + \pi, \lambda) = -A(0, \lambda) = Const., \qquad \forall\ \phi' \tag{4}$$

GHZ showed that the above relations are inconsistent with each other for $\phi = \frac{\pi}{2}, \phi' = 0$. Thus, they come to the conclusion that a hidden inconsistency is present in premises *(i)-(iv)*. In our approach to the GHZ theorem, we keep the hypotheses *i,iii,iv* as before and replace *ii* by the following statement [23]:
(ii') Non-locality: at the time of measurement, when the four particles interact, a real change can take place in a particle as a consequence of any thing that may be done on the other three particles.
The above condition changes our view about locality and the GHZ theorem. In [23], we defined non-locality condition at the hidden variable level as:

$$A(\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3, \phi_4, \lambda) = f_A(\phi_1, \lambda)g_A(\phi_2, \lambda)h_A(\phi_3, \lambda)k_A(\phi_4, \lambda) \tag{5}$$

Similar relations hold for B, C and D. Using the above form of non-locality, we have:

$$A(2\phi_1, 2\phi_2, 2\phi_3, 2\phi_4, \lambda) = A(0, 0, 0, 0, \lambda)$$

$$A(\theta_1 + \pi, \theta_2 + \pi, \theta_3 + \pi, \theta_4, \lambda) = -A(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \theta_4, \lambda)$$

For $\overrightarrow{\phi} = (\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}, 0)$ and $\overrightarrow{\theta} = (0, 0, 0, 0)$ one gets:

$$A(\pi, \pi, \pi, 0, \lambda) = A(0, 0, 0, 0, \lambda)$$

$$A(\pi, \pi, \pi, 0, \lambda) = -A(0, 0, 0, 0, \lambda)$$

which leads to the usual GHZ result.

3 Extension of Non-locality Condition to the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger Theorem

In this section we would like to extend our non-locality condition to a more general form. This form can be applied to a very large class of non-local hidden variable theories. One generalization of eq. (5) is in the following manner:

$$A(\phi_1,\phi_2,\phi_3,\phi_4,\lambda)=\sum_{j_A} f_A^{j_A}(\phi_1,\lambda)g_A^{j_A}(\phi_2,\lambda)h_A^{j_A}(\phi_3,\lambda)k_A^{j_A}(\phi_4,\lambda) \tag{6}$$

Where f, g, h and k are arbitrary functions that depend on their arguments with:

$$-1 \leq A(\phi_1,\phi_2,\phi_3,\phi_4,\lambda) \leq 1$$

and similar relations hold for B, C, D. This type of generalization is not special. Actually, for any realistic variable we can make such an assumption. Also, these variables could not be considered as a mathematical generalization but as something that could convey some physical meaning [24].

The product of these physical variables is:

$$ABCD=\prod_{i=A}^{D}\sum_{j_i} f_i^{j_i}(\phi_1,\lambda)g_i^{j_i}(\phi_2,\lambda)h_i^{j_i}(\phi_3,\lambda)k_i^{j_i}(\phi_4,\lambda) \tag{7}$$

We define the correlation function $E(\phi_1,\phi_2,\phi_3,\phi_4)$ in the form:

$$E(\phi_1,\phi_2,\phi_3,\phi_4)=\int\prod_{i=A}^{D}\sum_{j_i} f_i^{j_i}(\phi_1,\lambda)g_i^{j_i}(\phi_2,\lambda)h_i^{j_i}(\phi_3,\lambda)k_i^{j_i}(\phi_4,\lambda)\rho(\lambda)d\lambda \tag{8}$$

where the probability distribution function for the uncontrollable hidden variable λ is represented by $\rho(\lambda)$, with:

$$\int\rho(\lambda)d\lambda=1, \qquad \rho(\lambda)\geq 1$$

Using the relations (3) for the expectation value of the spin correlation, one can show that for $\phi_1+\phi_2-\phi_3-\phi_4=0$:

$$\prod_{i=A}^{D}\sum_{j_i} f_i^{j_i}(\phi,\lambda)g_i^{j_i}(\phi,\lambda)h_i^{j_i}(\phi,\lambda)k_i^{j_i}(\phi,\lambda)=-1 \tag{9}$$

$$\prod_{i=A}^{D}\sum_{j_i} f_i^{j_i}(\phi,\lambda)g_i^{j_i}(\phi',\lambda)h_i^{j_i}(\phi,\lambda)k_i^{j_i}(\phi',\lambda)=-1 \tag{10}$$

$$\prod_{i=A}^{D}\sum_{j_i} f_i^{j_i}(\phi,\lambda)g_i^{j_i}(\phi',\lambda)h_i^{j_i}(\phi',\lambda)k_i^{j_i}(\phi,\lambda)=-1 \tag{11}$$

$$\prod_{i=A}^{D}\sum_{j_i} f_i^{j_i}(\phi',\lambda)g_i^{j_i}(\phi,\lambda)h_i^{j_i}(\phi/2+\phi'/2,\lambda)k_i^{j_i}(\phi/2+\phi'/2,\lambda)=-1 \tag{12}$$

By changing ϕ' in Eq. (10), we get a set of equations (with constant ϕ) which can be written as a matrix equation:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \prod_{i=A}^{D} g_i^1(\phi_1')k_i^1(\phi_1') & . & . & \prod_{i=A}^{D} g_i^{j_i}(\phi_1')k_i^{j_i}(\phi_1') & . & . & \prod_{i=A}^{D} g_i^n(\phi_1')k_i^n(\phi_1') \\ \prod_{i=A}^{D} g_i^1(\phi_2')k_i^1(\phi_2') & . & . & \prod_{i=A}^{D} g_i^{j_i}(\phi_2')k_i^{j_i}(\phi_2') & . & . & \prod_{i=A}^{D} g_i^n(\phi_2')k_i^n(\phi_2') \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ \prod_{i=A}^{D} g_i^1(\phi_k')k_i^1(\phi_k') & . & . & \prod_{i=A}^{D} g_i^{j_i}(\phi_k')k_i^{j_i}(\phi_k') & . & . & \prod_{i=A}^{D} g_i^n(\phi_k')k_i^n(\phi_k') \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ \prod_{i=A}^{D} g_i^1(\phi_n')k_i^1(\phi_n') & . & . & \prod_{i=A}^{D} g_i^{j_i}(\phi_n')k_i^{j_i}(\phi_n') & . & . & \prod_{i=A}^{D} g_i^n(\phi_n')k_i^n(\phi_n') \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\times \begin{pmatrix} \prod_{i=A}^{D} f_i^1(\phi_1)h_i^1(\phi_1) \\ \prod_{i=A}^{D} f_i^2(\phi_1)h_i^2(\phi_1) \\ . \\ . \\ \prod_{i=A}^{D} f_i^{j_i}(\phi_1)h_i^{j_i}(\phi_1) \\ . \\ . \\ \prod_{i=A}^{D} f_i^n(\phi_1)h_i^n(\phi_1) \end{pmatrix} = - \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ . \\ . \\ 1 \\ . \\ . \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{13}$$

In the above matrix equation we have droped some of unnecessary indices for simplicity and ϕ''s are arbitrary angles (see appendix B).

Also, we can get similar matrix equations by changing ϕ and holding ϕ' constant. By calculating $\prod_{i=A}^{D} f_i^{j_i}(\phi_l, \lambda)h_i^{j_i}(\phi_l, \lambda)$ from each of these equations, we have:

$$\prod_{i=A}^{D} f_i^{j_i}(\phi_l, \lambda)h_i^{j_i}(\phi_l, \lambda) = \prod_{i=A}^{D} f_i^{j_i}(\phi_m, \lambda)h_i^{j_i}(\phi_m, \lambda) \tag{14}$$

In above relation, $f_i^{j_i}$ is the jth term of Eq. (6) related to ith party. (To distinguish between the functions of different parties we have tagged them, for example, by j_i). Similarly, by using Eq. (11), we have:

$$\prod_{i=A}^{D} f_i^{j_i}(\phi_l, \lambda)k_i^{j_i}(\phi_l, \lambda) = \prod_{i=A}^{D} f_i^{j_i}(\phi_m, \lambda)k_i^{j_i}(\phi_m, \lambda) \tag{15}$$

A consequence of these is that:

$$\prod_{i=A}^{D} h_i^{j_i}(\phi_l, \lambda)(k_i^{j_i}(\phi_l, \lambda)^{-1} = \prod_{i=A}^{D} h_i^{j_i}(\phi_m, \lambda)(k_i^{j_i}(\phi_m, \lambda))^{-1} \tag{16}$$

Now, we can use two approaches. First, by assuming that any term in the Eq. (6) is $f_i^{j_i}, g_i^{j_i}, h_i^{j_i}, k_i^{j_i} = \pm 1$, Eq. (16) can be written in the following form (cf [23]),

$$\prod_{i=A}^{D} h_i^{j_i}(\phi_l, \lambda)k_i^{j_i}(\phi_l, \lambda) = \prod_{i=A}^{D} h_i^{j_i}(\phi_m, \lambda)k_i^{j_i}(\phi_m, \lambda) \tag{17}$$

Second, by considering that $A^2(\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3, \phi_4, \lambda) = 1$ and using Eq. (6), we can construct matrix equations similar to (13), which finally lead to:

$$[f_A^{j_A}(\phi_1, \lambda)]^2 = X(\Phi, \lambda) \tag{18}$$

where Φ does not contain ϕ_1 (see appendix A). Although, the above equation is surprising, nevertheless, if $f_i^{j_i} = \pm 1$, we can convince ourself with this result. The above relation holds for any ϕ_1 and similar relations

holds for g, h, k. If we consider $k_i^{j_i}$ type of Eq. (18) and apply to Eq. (16), we get Eq. (17) again. Now, by using Eqs. (9), (12) and (17), and after some algebra, we have:

$$\prod_{i=A}^{D} f_i^{j_i}(\phi_l, \lambda) = \prod_{i=A}^{D} f_i^{j_i}(\phi_m, \lambda) \tag{19}$$

Similar relations can be derived for g, h and k. This equation is a quite surprising result, we would expect the change of f, g, h and k's arguments, which their combination represents an intrinsic spin quantity, to have some different outcomes.

We can repeat the whole calculation by assuming that $\phi_1 + \phi_2 - \phi_3 - \phi_4 = \pi$ in the Eq. (8). Then we have:

$$\prod_{i=A}^{D} \sum_{j_i} f_i^{j_i}(\phi' + \pi, \lambda) g_i^{j_i}(\phi, \lambda) h_i^{j_i}(\phi/2 + \phi'/2, \lambda) k_i^{j_i}(\phi/2 + \phi'/2, \lambda) = 1 \tag{20}$$

From the Eqs. (9), (17), and (20), we have:

$$\prod_{i=A}^{D} f_i^{j_i}(\phi_s, \lambda) = -\prod_{i=A}^{D} f_i^{j_i}(\phi_k + \pi, \lambda) \tag{21}$$

Now, considering Eqs. (19) and (21), it is easily seen that for $\phi_l = \phi_s = \phi_k = 0, \phi_m = \pi$, and we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{i=A}^{D} f_i^{j_i}(0, \lambda) &= \prod_{i=A}^{D} f_i^{j_i}(\pi, \lambda) \\ \prod_{i=A}^{D} f_i^{j_i}(0, \lambda) &= -\prod_{i=A}^{D} f_i^{j_i}(\pi, \lambda) \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

We thus have brought to surface an inconsistency hidden in the premisses (i, ii', iii, iv). We can also consider equations (19) and (21) for g, h, k. One gets:

$$A(\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3, \phi_4, \lambda) = A(\phi_1', \phi_2', \phi_3', \phi_4', \lambda) \tag{23}$$

$$A(\varphi_1 + \pi, \varphi_2, \varphi_3, \varphi_4, \lambda) = -A(\varphi_1', \varphi_2', \varphi_3', \varphi_4', \lambda) \tag{24}$$

By using suitable angles, a discrepancy in one A's would result. So we reach the same results as the GHZ theorem, even though we are using a special case of non-locality. Our approach rules out a broader class of hidden variable theories.

4 Conclusion

Bell's theorem [2] states that any local realistic view of the world is incompatible with QM. This is often interpreted as demonstrating the existence of non-locality in QM [25].

In this paper, we have replaced Bell's locality condition by a more general condition to obtain the GHZ theorem and have shown that the same incompatibility exist for the case of non-local realistic models. Thus, we can conclude that the disagreement in the GHZ theorem is not necessarily due to the violation of Bell's locality condition. Consequently, we should focus on other GHZ assumptions to find the origin of inconsistency. Also, it is worthy to note that one could even go further and extend the above non-local approach to other relevant theorems such as Kochen-Specker [8], CH [7] and Hardy [26] theorems.

There exists an important question: do some non-local hidden variable theories exist that our approach can be applied to them? One can expects more general cases of non-local theories which are incompatible with quantum mechanics. However, it is an open problem whether one can construct a hidden variable model, satisfying the above requirements, to show the consistency of our argument in a more concrete manner. Further more, in another paper, we showed that it is not possible to reproduce a QM correlation, using only local measurements (done by two space-like separated parties), augmented with a classical communication

having one bit information [19] or by a single use of non-local box [20]. Although, other people have shown that all of QM properties cannot be simulated by a nonlocal box completely [21, 22].

Therefore, it can be concluded that some other alternative view points might be involved. On the other hand, these are people who still believe that QM is a local theory [27], and some others consider information as the root of the interpretation of QM [13]. Hence, G. Brassard and co-workers suggested the field of communication complexity, which concerns the amount of information that must be transmitted between two parties to compute some function of private inputs that they hold [28]. Anyway, the above arguments indicate that we must have a deeper understanding of the notions of locality, reality and entanglement.

Acknowledgment: We would like to thank P. H. Eberhard for his comments and A. T. Rezakhani for critical reading of the manuscript. (This work was supported under the project: $AZAD$).

5 Appendix A: Measurement Results Matrix Equation

In this appendix, we would like to derive the equation (18). As we mentioned, by using equations $A^2(\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3, \phi_4, \lambda) = 1$ and (6), we construct matrix equation as follows:

$$\begin{pmatrix} [g_A^1(\phi_2^1)h_A^1(\phi_3^1)k_A^1(\phi_4^1)]^2 & . & . & g_A^{j_A}(\phi_2^1)h_A^{j_A}(\phi_3^1)k_A^{j_A}(\phi_4^1)g_A^{s_A}(\phi_2^1)h_A^{s_A}(\phi_3^1)k_A^{s_A}(\phi_4^1) & . & . & [g_A^n(\phi_2^1)h_A^n(\phi_3^1)k_A^n(\phi_4^1)]^2 \\ [g_A^1(\phi_2^2)h_A^1(\phi_3^2)k_A^1(\phi_4^2)]^2 & . & . & g_A^{j_A}(\phi_2^2)h_A^{j_A}(\phi_3^2)k_A^{j_A}(\phi_4^2)g_A^{s_A}(\phi_2^2)h_A^{s_A}(\phi_3^2)k_A^{s_A}(\phi_4^2) & . & . & [g_A^n(\phi_2^2)h_A^n(\phi_3^2)k_A^n(\phi_4^2)]^2 \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ [g_A^1(\phi_2^k)h_A^1(\phi_3^k)k_A^1(\phi_4^k)]^2 & . & . & g_A^{j_A}(\phi_2^k)h_A^{j_A}(\phi_3^k)k_A^{j_A}(\phi_4^k)g_A^{s_A}(\phi_2^k)h_A^{s_A}(\phi_3^k)k_A^{s_A}(\phi_4^k) & . & . & [g_A^n(\phi_2^k)h_A^n(\phi_3^k)k_A^n(\phi_4^k)]^2 \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ [g_A^1(\phi_2^n)h_A^1(\phi_3^n)k_A^1(\phi_4^n)]^2 & . & . & g_A^{j_A}(\phi_2^n)h_A^{j_A}(\phi_3^n)k_A^{j_A}(\phi_4^n)g_A^{s_A}(\phi_2^n)h_A^{s_A}(\phi_3^n)k_A^{s_A}(\phi_4^n) & . & . & [g_A^n(\phi_2^n)h_A^n(\phi_3^n)k_A^n(\phi_4^n)]^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\times \begin{pmatrix} [f_A^1(\phi_1)]^2 \\ f_A^1(\phi_1)f_A^2(\phi_1) \\ . \\ . \\ f_A^{j_A}(\phi_1)f_A^{s_A}(\phi_1) \\ . \\ . \\ [f_A^n(\phi_1)]^2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ . \\ . \\ 1 \\ . \\ . \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{25}$$

In the above matrix equation we have dropped some of unnecessary indices for simplicity and ϕ_l^k's are arbitrary angles.

We would like to solve the above matrix equation to derive column matrix element functions $f_A^{j_A}(\phi_1)$ with $j_A = 1, ..., n$. It is not complicated to show that the above matrix equation is solvable if matrix equations which have been constructed by $A(\phi_1, \phi_k, \phi_l, \phi_m, \lambda) = \pm 1$ (similar to the matrix equation with fix ϕ_1 and arbitrary ϕ_2^k, ϕ_3^l and ϕ_4^m with $k = 1, ..., n$) have inverse. That matrix equation has the following form:

$$(ghk)_{n\times n}(f)_{n\times 1} = (\pm 1)_{n\times 1} \tag{26}$$

If one of rows or columns of (ghk) would be a linear combination of other rows or columns respectively, then, (ghk) matrix has not inverse.

In the first case, where (one of rows would be equal to a linear combination of other rows), we get to the appropriate relations:

$$\begin{aligned} g_A^{j_A}(\phi_2^l, \lambda) &= g_A^{j_A}(\phi_2^q, \lambda) \\ h_A^{j_A}(\phi_3^l, \lambda) &= h_A^{j_A}(\phi_3^q, \lambda) \\ k_A^{j_A}(\phi_4^l, \lambda) &= k_A^{j_A}(\phi_4^q, \lambda) \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

In other words, g, h, k are independent of their arguments. In other cases (one of columns would be equal to linear combination of other columns), we would have, for example:

$$g^1_A(\phi_l,\lambda)h^1_A(\phi_q,\lambda)k^1_A(\phi_s,\lambda) = g^2_A(\phi_l,\lambda)h^2_A(\phi_q,\lambda)k^2_A(\phi_s,\lambda)$$

At lest two sentences in the A expansion (6) are equal to each other. It is not complicated to show that after a rearrangement of A sentences, we get the same matrix equation as (26). After, solving the matrix equation (25), we would be get an appropriate result:

$$[f^{j_A}_A(\phi_1,\lambda)]^2 = X(\Phi,\lambda) \qquad f^{j_A}_A(\phi_1,\lambda)f^{s_A}_A(\phi_1,\lambda) = Y(\Phi,\lambda) \tag{28}$$

where Φ does not contain ϕ_1. If we repeat equation (25), with the change of ϕ_1 (g, h and k arguments don't change), we derive similar equations as (28), thus:

$$[f^k_A(\phi^l_1)]^2 = [f^k_A(\phi^m_1)]^2 \qquad f^{j_A}_A(\phi^l_1)f^{s_A}_A(\phi^l_1) = f^{j_A}_A(\phi^m_1)f^{s_A}_A(\phi^m_1) \tag{29}$$

6 Appendix B: Correlation Function's Matrix Equation

Matrix equation (13) has the following form:

$$(GK)_{n\times n}(FH)_{n\times 1} = -(1)_{n\times 1} \tag{30}$$

We would like to solve the above matrix equation to derive column matrix element functions $(FH)_{i,1}$, if one of rows or columns of (GK) would be a linear combination of other rows or columns respectively, then, (GK) matrix has no inverse. In the first case (one of rows would be equal to a linear combination of other rows), we get the appropriate relation

$$\prod_{i=A}^{D} g^{j_i}_i(\phi'_l,\lambda)k^{j_i}_i(\phi'_l,\lambda) = \prod_{i=A}^{D} g^{j_i}_i(\phi'_k,\lambda)k^{j_i}_i(\phi'_k,\lambda), \tag{31}$$

This says that these combinations of g and k are independent of their arguments (ϕ'_l). In the other case (one of columns would be equal to a linear combination of other columns), we would have, for example, $g^1_A(\phi'_1,\lambda)k^1_A(\phi'_1,\lambda) = g^2_A(\phi'_1,\lambda)k^2_A(\phi'_1,\lambda)$ (at lest two sentences in the A expansion (6) are equal to each other), it is not complicated to show that after a rearrangement of A sentence and solving a matrix equation, similar to Eq. (12), we get:

$$f^1_A(\phi_l,\lambda)h^1_A(\phi_l,\lambda) + f^2_A(\phi_l,\lambda)h^2_A(\phi_l,\lambda) = f^1_A(\phi_k,\lambda)h^1_A(\phi_k,\lambda) + f^2_A(\phi_k,\lambda)h^2_A(\phi_k,\lambda) \tag{32}$$

After using equation (29) and similar relations for $h^{j_A}_A$ and $h^{j_A}_A$, we get the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} f^1_A(\phi_l,\lambda)h^1_A(\phi_l,\lambda) &= f^1_A(\phi_k,\lambda)h^1_A(\phi_k,\lambda) \\ f^2_A(\phi_l,\lambda)h^2_A(\phi_l,\lambda) &= f^2_A(\phi_k,\lambda)h^2_A(\phi_k,\lambda) \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

That is appropriate result for derivation of eq. (14) again.

References

[1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **47**, 777 (1935).

[2] J.s. Bell, Physics (Long Island City, N.Y.) **1**, 195 (1964); reprinted in Bell, J.S. *Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1987).

[3] A. Aspect, P. Grangier, and G. Roger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49**, 91-94 (1982); A. Aspect, J. Dalibard, and G. Roger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49**, 1804-1807 (1982); W. Tittel, *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 3563-3566 (1998); J. Pan, *et al.*, *Nature* **403**, 515 (2000); M. A. Rowe, *et al.*, *Nature* **409**, 791 (2001); A. Vaziri, G. Weihs, and A. Zeilinger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 240401 (2002); T. B. Pittman, and J. D. Franson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 240401 (2003); Y. Huang, *et al. Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 250401 (2003); Z. Zhao, *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 180401 (2003); W. Tittel, and G. Weihs, *Q. Inf. Comp.* **1**, 3 (2001); Z. Chen, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 160408 (2003); C. Simon, C. Brukner, and A. Zeilinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 4427 (2001); C. A. Sackett, *et al.*, Nature **404**, 256 (2000).

[4] J. Barrett, D. Collins, L. Hardy, A. Kent, and S. Popescu, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 42111 (2002).

[5] A. Aspect, *Nature* **398**, 189-190 (1999); N. Gisin, and H. Zbinden, *Phys. Lett. A* **264**, 103-107 (1999); P. G. Kwiat, *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. A* **49**, 3209-3220 (1994); M. Freyberger, *et al. Phys. Rev. A* **53**, 1232-1244 (1996); A. Beige, W. J. Munro, and P. L. Knight, *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 0521021 (2000).

[6] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **23**, 880 (1969).

[7] J. F. Clauser, and M.A. Horne, Phys. Rev.D **10**, 526 (1974);

[8] S. Kochen, E. P. Specker, J. Math. **17**, 59 (1967).

[9] D. M. Greenberger, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, A. Zeilinger, Am. J. Phys. **58**, 1131 (1990).

[10] L. Hardy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 1665 (1993).

[11] A. Cabello, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 1911 (2001).

[12] V. Scarani, and N. Gisin, Phys. Lett. A **295**, 167 (2002).

[13] A. Zeilinger, *Nature* **408**, 639-641 (2000); A. Zeilinger, *Nature* **438**, 743 (2005); Brukner and A. Zeilinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3354 (1999); Brukner and A. Zeilinger, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 022113 (2001); Brukner and A. Zeilinger, e-print arXiv:quantph/0212084; Brukner and A. Zeilinger, Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. A **360**, 1061 (2002), e-print arXiv:quant-ph/0201026; A. Shafiee, F. Safinejad, F. Naqsh Foundations of Physics Letters, **19**, No. 1, (2006).

[14] J. Wenger, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 12105 (2003); H. Jeong, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 12106 (2003); Z. Chen, and Y. Zhang, quant-ph/0103082; S. Massar, and S. Pironio, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 62108 (2001); P. van Loock, and S. L. Braunstein, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 22106 (2001), for compleat review read S. L. Braunstein and P. Van Loock Rev. Mod. Phys. **77**, 513 (2005).

[15] D. Kaszlikowski, and M. Zukowski, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 22114 (2000).

[16] A. Cabello, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 22104 (2001); D. Kaszlikowski, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 4418 (2000).

[17] A. Cabello, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 60403 (2002).

[18] G. Brassard, R. Cleve and A. Tapp, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1874 (1999); G. Brassard, quant-ph/0101005.

[19] B. F. Toner and D. Bacon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 187904 (2003); D. Bacon and B. F. Toner , Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 157904 (2003); K. Svozil, Phys. Rev. A **72** 050302 (R) (2005).

[20] S. Popescu and D. Rohrlich, Found. Phys. **24**, 379 (1994); N. J. Cerf, N. Gisin, S. Massar, and S. Popescu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 220403 (2005); J. Barrett and S. Pironio, Physical Review Letters **95** 140401 (2005); N. Brunner, N. Gisin and V. Scarani, New Journal of Physics **7** 88 (2005).

[21] A. J. Short *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 012101 (2006).

[22] Barrett, J. and Pironio, S., (2005) Phys. Rev. Lett. **95** 140401.

[23] A. Fahmi, and M. Golshani, Phys. Lett. A, **306**, 259, (2003).

[24] For example in ref [25], p. 140, the authors have defined some sets of hidden variables where the result of measurement depend on them (hidden variables μ_a and μ_b associated with the corresponding pieces of measuring apparatus of the first and second particles respectively. In addition there will be some sets of variables λ_A and λ_B, belonging to the particle A and B themselves).

[25] D. Bohm, and B. J. Hiley, *The Undivided Universe: an ontological interpretation of quantum theory* (Routledge 1993).

[26] L. Hardy, Phys. Lett. A **161**, 21 (1991).

[27] A. Peres, private communication. A. Peres, and D. R. Terno, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **76**, (2004).

[28] G. Brassard, *Nature* **1**, 2-4 (2005); G. Brassard, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 250401 (2006).